

Application No. 09/781,823
Amendment "B" dated August 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 1, 2005

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies that were extended during the recent in person interview held on July 22, 2005. The amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals discussed during the interview.

The Final Office Action of July 1, 2001 considered and rejected claims 1-14.¹

By this paper, claims 1, 11 and 12 have been amended, claims 15-22 (which were previously withdrawn) have been cancelled, and new claims 23 and 24 have been added, such that claims 1-12 and 23-24 remain pending, of which claims 1 and 11 are the independent claims at issue.²

As discussed during the interview, the claims are generally directed to embodiments in which semantic components of a text message are identified and differentiated and then compressed according to corresponding compression techniques. As further clarified by the claim amendments, the differentiation of semantic components can be based on whether a component is a natural language component or not (claims 1 and 11) and whether a component is an essential component or not (new claims 23-24). The compression techniques will then vary depending on the type of component.

As further discussed during the interview, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention, either singly or in combination, and such that the claims are distinguished from the art of record.

In view of the foregoing, the rejections of record have been overcome (as generally indicated in the interview summary) such that they are now moot, and such that it is not

¹ Claims 10 and 13 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1, 11-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,978,820 (Mase et al.). Claims 2-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,978,820 (Mase et al.). Claims 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,978,820 (Mase et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,304 (Grefenstette), as applied to claims 1 and 12, respectively, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,850,476 (Chen et al.). Although the prior art status and some of the assertions made with regard to the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status and assertions made with regard to the cited art, as well as any official notice, which was taken in the last response, at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise, such as, for example in a subsequent amendment or during prosecution of a related application. Accordingly, Applicants' decision not to respond to any particular assertions or rejections in this paper should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to said assertions or rejections.

² Support for the claim amendments and new claims are supported by the disclosure found on pages 5 and 17-22.


Application No. 09/781,823
Amendment "B" dated August 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 1, 2005

necessary to address each of the other assertions of record in the last response. Nevertheless, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of said assertions in the future.

In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 23 day of August, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 26,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

RDN:JCJ:ppa
PPA0000000741V001